

**REMARKS**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for her courtesy during an interview which was held on 27 January 2009. During the interview, Applicant discussed the Schneck reference. Applicant pointed out that, while this reference teaches the delivery of a set of information referred to as packaged data (see, for example, Figure 2), any rights to such data and any versions of such data are derived at the client computer from this packaged data. That is, there is a single delivery of content made from the server to the client.

In contrast thereto, Applicant's invention delivers two separate versions of a specific document to the user. Applicant clearly and unambiguously claims the delivery to a user of a first user viewable version of the actual contents of a specific document, and the delivery to the user of a second version of the actual contents of the specific document.

At the conclusion of the interview, the Examiner indicated that she understood the difference between the cited prior art and the claimed invention. Without any desire to mischaracterize the Examiner, Applicant is of the opinion that the Examiner agreed with Applicant that claimed invention is patently distinct from the cited prior art. Accordingly, the invention as claimed is novel and should be entitled to patent protection.

Should he Examiner deem it helpful, she is encouraged to contact Applicant's attorney, Michael A. Glenn, at (650) 474-8400.

Respectfully Submitted,



Michael A. Glenn  
Reg. No. 30,176

Customer No. 22862